



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1459  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,740	12/11/2000	Shohjiroh Tanase	200592US0X	2333

22850 7590 05/20/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

CHOI, LING SIU

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1713

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,740

Applicant(s)

Tanase et al.

Examiner

Ling-Siu Choi

Art Unit

1713



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 14, 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 5-7 and 12-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8-11, and 23-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1713

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed February 14, 2003. Claims 25-29 have been added. Claims 1-29 are now pending. Since claims 4 and 11 are rejected based on the new ground, this Office Action is made as a second non-final one.

### *Claim Rejections*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1713

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

4. Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Murata et al. (US 4,960,743).

*The present invention relates to a solid magnesium compound substantially comprising a magnesium alkoxide, whose particle size distribution index  $[P = (D_{90} / D_{10})]$  is less than 4.0 (summary of claim 4).*

Murata et al. disclose a magnesium compound obtained by reacting (a) magnesium metal, (b) a halogenated hydrocarbon of RX, (c) a compound of  $X_n^1M(OR^1)_{m-n}$ , and (d) a halogen-containing alcohol, wherein "the amount of the halogenated hydrocarbon to be used is desired to fall in the range of 1 to 2 moles per gram atom of magnesium" and wherein the contact temperature for components (a), (b), and (c) falls into the range of 0°-250°C and the contact temperature for the resulting product and component (d) falls into the range of -20°C to 150°C (Abstract; col. 5, lines 16-24 and 62-64; claim 1). It is noted that Murata et al. are silent on the particle size distribution index being less than 4. In view of the substantially similar method used to make the magnesium compound, the Examiner has a reasonable base to believe that the resulting magnesium compound would possess the claimed particle size distribution index. Since the PTO does not have proper means to conduct experiments, the burden of proof is now shifted

Art Unit: 1713

to applicants to show otherwise. **In re Best**, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977); **In re Fitzgerald**, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata et al. (US 4,960,743) or Mehta (US 4,820,672).

*The present invention relates to a magnesium compound obtained by reacting a magnesium metal, an alcohol, and a halogen and/or a halogen-containing metal compound at 30-60°C, wherein the gram atoms ratio of halogen atom to magnesium is at least 0.0001 (claim 1).*

Murata et al. disclose a magnesium compound obtained by reacting (a) magnesium metal, (b) a halogenated hydrocarbon of RX, (c) a compound of  $X_n^1M(OR^1)_{m-n}$ , and (d) a halogen-containing alcohol, wherein "the amount of the halogenated hydrocarbon to be used is desired to fall in the range of 1 to 2 moles per gram atom of magnesium" (abstract; col. 5, lines 16-18; claim 1). Murata et al. further disclose that the contact temperature for components (a), (b), and (c) falls into the range of 0°-250°C and the contact temperature for the resulting product and component (d) falls into the range of -20°C to 150°C (col. 5, lines 19-24 and 62-64).

Art Unit: 1713

Mehta discloses a magnesium compound obtained by (a) contacting 6.0 gm magnesium metal, a few crystals of iodine, and 22.85 gm n-BuCl and then (b) contacting the resulting product with 2-methyl-1-pentanol at 55°C (Example 2).

The difference between the present claims and the disclosure of Murata et al. or Mehta is the requirement of a halogen and/or a halogen-containing metal compound being used to form the solid magnesium compound.

It is noted that the present claims are drawn to product-by-process ones. The case law holds that "[T]he patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695,698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed.Cir. 1985).

***Response to the Applicants' Argument***

6. Applicant's arguments received on February 14, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is noted that the magnesium compound is made in the presence of a halogen and/or halogen-containing metal compound but not halogen-containing hydrocarbon. However, the magnesium compound obtained from the present invention is believed to be a magnesium alkoxide, which would be the same as one obtained in the disclosure of Murata et al. (US

Art Unit: 1713


4,960,743) or Mehta (US 4,820,672). Furthermore, since the present invention is drawn to a product- by- process, the case law holds that "[T]he patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, **the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.**" *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695,698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed.Cir. 1985).

### *Conclusion*

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ling-Siu Choi whose telephone number is (703)305-0887.

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, can be reached on (703)308-2450.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-2351.



Ling-Siu Choi

May 17, 2003